

REMARKS

This responds to the Office Action mailed on April 27, 2006.

No claims are amended, no claims are canceled, and no claims are added; as a result, claims 1-30 are now pending in this application. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the above-identified application in view of the remarks that follow.

§102 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1, 5, 8, 10, 15, 18, 20 and 22 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Hiraide et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0124217). Applicant traverses these grounds of rejection of these claims.

Applicant reserves the right to swear behind Hiraide et al. (hereafter Hiraide) at a later date.

Applicant cannot find in Hiraide, as proffered in the Office Action, a disclosure, a teaching, or a suggestion of an apparatus having a seed register, a linear feedback shift register, and a signature register, where each have equal register lengths as recited in claim 1. In the Office Action, it is stated with respect to paragraph [0147] of Hiraide that “it is clear to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicants’ invention that there must be a storage means for the prepared seed value.” Applicant submits that the issue of anticipation of claim 1 with respect to Hiraide is whether Hiraide teaches a “storage means” structured as recited in claim 1 and arranged with other features as recited in claim 1. Since claim 1 recites a specific structure that is not taught or suggested in Hiraide, Applicant submits that Hiraide does not teach each and every claim element of claim 1, Hiraide does not teach the identical invention in as complete detail as is contained in claim 1, and that Hiraide does not teach each and every claim element arranged as in claim 1. Therefore, Applicant submits that Hiraide does not anticipate claim 1 and that claim 1 is patentable over Hiraide. For at least reasons similar to those discussed herein with respect claim 1, Applicant submits that independent claims 5 and 22 are patentable over Hiraide.

With respect to claim 15, Applicant cannot find in the Office Action a specific discussion of the features of the method recited in claim 15. In the Office Action, it is stated that “ ‘A plurality of seed values (seed value set) to be set in the LFSR 2 are beforehand prepared.’ ” Applicant cannot find in Hiraide the details of the “beforehand prepared” seed values. In

addition, Applicant cannot find in the Office Action a discussion of the details of the “beforehand prepared” seed values. Figure 15 shows the set of seed values in a manner similar to the ATPG pattern, which can be taken to mean that the set of seed values is provided to Hiraide’s LFSR 2 from external to the integrated circuit, which does not disclose or teach loading a seed register in an integrated circuit and transferring the seed values from the seed register to a linear feedback shift register. Therefore, Applicant submits that Hiraide, as proffered in the Office Action, does not teach the identical invention in as complete detail as is contained in claim 15. Thus, Applicant submits that Hiraide does not anticipate claim 15 and that claim 15 is patentable over Hiraide.

Claims 8 and 10 and claims 18 and 20 depend on claims 5 and 15, respectively. Thus, Applicant submits that claims 8, 10, 18, and 20 are patentable over Hiraide for at least the reasons discussed herein with respect to the independent claims.

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of these rejections of claims 1, 5, 8, 10, 15, 18, 20 and 22, and reconsideration and allowance of these claims.

§103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 28-29 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hiraide et al. as applied to claim 22 above, and further in view of Wu et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2005/0050400). Applicant traverses these grounds of rejection of these claims.

Applicant reserves the right to swear behind Wu et al.(hereafter Wu) at a later date.

Applicant submits that, as discussed above, claim 22 is patentable over Hiraide. For at least reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 22, Applicant submits that claim 22 is patentable over Hiraide in view of Wu, as proffered in the Office Action. Claims 28-29 depend on claim 22. Therefore, Applicant submits that claims 28-29 are patentable over Hiraide in view of Wu.

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of these rejections of claims 28-29, and reconsideration and allowance of these claims.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 2-4, 6-7, 9, 11-14, 16-17, 19, 21, 23-27 and 30 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

For at least the reasons discussed herein, Applicant submits that the independent claims of the instant application are patentable over the cited art. Therefore, the claims that depend from the independent claims are patentable over the cited art.

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of these objections of claims 2-4, 6-7, 9, 11-14, 16-17, 19, 21, 23-27 and 30, and reconsideration and allowance of these claims.

Assertion of Pertinence

Applicant has not responded to the assertion of pertinence stated for the patents cited, but not relied upon, by the Office Action since these patents are not relied upon as part of the rejections in this Office Action. Applicant is expressly not conceding they have any pertinence and reserves the right to respond more fully should any of them form a part of some future rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney ((612) 371-2157) to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

ABHIJIT JAS ET AL.

By their Representatives,
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
Attorneys for Intel Corporation
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55402
(612) 371-2157

Date

27 July 2006

By



David R. Cochran
Reg. No. 46,632

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being filed using the USPTO's electronic filing system EFS-Web, and is addressed to: MS Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this 27th day of July 2006.

Name

Amy Moriarty

Signature

